

political force which can offer a real and visible alternative to the political and economic problems of American society. Socialism would not be heaven on earth, but the system would allow for tremendous improvement of the present problems of American society.

Our isolation from the working class and the real world in general has led us to misinterpret the apathy we see. Given the political and economic conditions underlying this apathy, it is possible to recruit many more people to the socialist movement.

It is quite true that "we cannot offer these people anything" - at least not in the sense that we can put more food in their mouths next week if they sign up today. But to think that average Americans cannot be interested in working to attain goals which they cannot teach for awhile is to seriously underestimate them. People are not universally nearsighted. People will work for what they want, and what people in general want is not always an immediate material gain for themselves.

In conclusion we propose a socialist movement which attempts to recruit by presenting to the general public its radical alternative to class society. We do not advocate merger with the Socialist Labor Party, for we do not propose that the Socialist movement cease to relate to the immediate needs and demands of the American working people. But we do propose that in order to build any sort of socialist movement, we must do so largely on the basis of discussing the needs and struggle for socialism.

Such a reorientation of our movement will not result in a massive SP and YPSL. The lack of struggle even where it might be successful in many areas is an indication that we shouldn't hope for too much. But we do think that such a perspective could increase the size and strength of our movement to a great extent. We think that our perspective is realistic. We may be wrong. But we know for certain that we can't do any worse than we will do by adhering to the holding-operation theory. The best we can do with a holding operation is to hold; the best we can do with a-x in a phone booth is make a phone call.

No. 4, 1964

Worker & Soldier

Socialist Party, USA

URGENT

Wanted: Films and recordings of Norman Thomas, any year, any speech. Needed for television documentary celebrating the 80th birthday of Norman Thomas. NEEDED AT ONCE! Send to the National Office, Room 402, 1182 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10001.

HAMMER AND TONGS
1964, No. 4

Table of Contents

page		
1.	Notes to be Pinned to the Office Wall	David McReynolds
3.	Letter to the National Committee	R. W. Tucker
7.	Letters from Members	
9.	Reports from Columbia, Mo.	William Allen
11.	Report on Activities	Betty Elkin
15.	Fund Drive, 1964	Norman Thomas

NOTE: Please send in reports of your activities for future issues of Hammer and Tongs.

Socialist Party
1182 Broadway
N.Y., N.Y. 10001

MEMO TO BE PINNED TO THE OFFICE WALL

-1-

by David McReynolds

It may seem quite odd for Hammer and Tongs to carry suggestions about how we ought to conduct the 1966 Convention when the dust from our 1964 Convention hasn't even settled yet. However, if Socialists really believe in planning, then it is not so outrageous to think two years ahead and to jot down some observations on points where SP conventions falter - while those points are still painfully fresh in our minds.

For my part I pledge to pin this memo to my office wall, hoping that I shall take due notice of it at least six months before the next convention. Briefly, may I suggest that in organizing our 1966 Convention we attempt the following:

1. Political documents should begin to come out six months before the Convention. Under no circumstances should major documents appear on the floor of the Convention itself, when it is quite patently impossible for the resolutions and motions, etc., to be given any serious study. We are surely all guilty for the present situation, myself included. It is fantastic that the major document on political action should be presented to the delegates on Friday morning! It is incredible that all of us with foreign policy planks should place these before the Party only as delegates are arriving in the convention hall! Surely at least the members of the National Committee ought to show some sense of responsibility in this matter and the Party ought not to let me, or Harrington, or Friend, or anyone else wander in with major documents after all the delegates have been elected and all possibility for serious discussion within the Party has been rendered utterly impossible. I suspect the SP is the only political body in the country where all the major documents are debated and discussed fully only after they have been adopted.

2. All of us should keep in mind that we cannot nominate any comrade for the NC or as an alternate to the NC unless we have canvassed them first. Having forgotten to do this, I was unable to place in nomination the names of Warren Morse, of Erich Fromm, or of others that I might have felt would have been excellent material for the NC - because I had not written them first to find if they would serve if elected.

3. Particular care should be given to who is chosen to chair the various convention sessions. With all due respect I do not think our convention chairmen have always been competent to the demanding task. (And I do say this with all due respect - I would certainly never undertake to chair a convention of the SP, recognizing that I could not handle this job.) The post of chairman ought not to be a matter for caucuses but rather a search for the competent. In this regard I place in nomination now (to remind myself later) the names of Julius Bernstein, Ann Draper, Phyllis Jacobson, Joe Glass and Michael Harrington, all of whom, on the occasions when I have seen them operate, proved to be first rate chairmen.

4. Delegates should keep in mind that a Convention cannot act as an administrative body, although, legally speaking, it has the power to do so. A Convention is simply not competent to pass motions allocating segments of the dues to this and that fund, or to bind the N.C. to special projects such as hiring an organizer. Delegates who, for example, consider the hiring of a national organizer as a task of first importance, should elect an NC which they feel is committed to that proposition and will carry it through if feasible. But the job of a convention is to set the political line of the Party and then to elect those officers who can best deal with the day to day organizational complexities. If a previous NC has shown itself incompetent to this task, the solution

(McReynolds)

-2-

is not to turn the Convention into an organizing "committee of the whole", but to select a new N.C.

5. Without impinging on free debate, delegates should be discouraged from a certain frivolity in the making of motions, of amendments, and of trying to heckle the convention (through points of order, etc.) into adopting one position or another. Such devices limit the time available for serious debate. We have only so many hours for a convention, and if those hours are spent on points of order, appealing the decision of the Chair, etc., we simply have fewer hours for a real discussion.

6. When a significant political motion has been introduced, it would be a courtesy to the maker of the motion to check with him before offering to speak for it. This is particularly true, for example, when the procedure has been set up that there will be only two or three speakers on each side. Comrade Friend, in presenting his motion on foreign policy, unfortunately had not had a chance to line up the three "pro" speakers he was entitled to, which meant that his point of view suffered in the presentation. On my own motion for unilateral disarmament I had checked in advance with Tom Barton who, fortunately, got the recognition of the chair, and spoke very effectively for the motion. There were other hands raised, however, and it was rather by luck that Barton got the floor.

7. Sometimes I am discouraged with Socialists, who, having proclaimed their absolute confidence that the working class is competent to run a complex industrial society and that illiterates should be fully empowered to vote (I support both propositions, let me make it clear), then get themselves hopelessly confused on so simple a matter as a preferential voting system. If the delegates to an SP convention do not understand R, then I must say the "vanguard of the working class" is in poor shape indeed. May I suggest now that some comrade - perhaps Arlon Tussing - who understands the various systems of voting, including the Ware system, the Hare system, a straight majority ballot, and bullet balloting, take the time to write a solid analysis of various methods of voting, their advantages and disadvantages, so that at the next convention delegates will not only know how to mark their ballots without invalidating them, but will also understand something about how to slate their nominees - since any system of voting works properly only if all those involved understand it.

From: R. W. Tucker

To: The National Committee of the Socialist Party, USA

-3-

Dear Comrades:

I am very sorry to have to tell you that you have put me in a position where it is impossible for me to continue to act as the Party's spokesman on socialized medicine and medical reform.

I have been working through the minutes of the convention in connection with my chore of editing the 1964 platform, and on page 5 I find that the convention amended the platform section on socialized medicine to include this passage: "In order to provide prescribed drugs for all citizens free of charge, coordinate research, and eliminate costly duplication of production, we favor the nationalization of the pharmaceutical industry. This would end the criminal recklessness with which new drugs are frequently released on the market and the wasteful competition and advertising which runs up drug costs. Research and production should be coordinated with university laboratories, and policy should be set by a council made up of representatives of pharmaceutical workers, pharmacists, the medical professions, and universities."

This wasn't even debated; the platform committee accepted it. Though that committee included several comrades who knew perfectly well that I am totally unable, as well as unwilling, to defend any such proposition.

I do not regard this as a deliberate slight or a deliberate attempt to overrule me; I suspect comrades were tired, and in their tiredness were ready enough to adopt something that sounded nice and radical without thinking very deeply about it. But it was adopted -- and it's I who has to live with it and defend it in public.

To anybody who knows anything about the drug industry, this passage is half-baked. The goals mentioned can all be achieved in ways short of nationalization. Research is already "coordinated" with universities; the bill for academic pharmacological research is largely picked up by the drug companies today, the rest of it by the Federal government. Actually academic research in drugs is carried on mainly in teaching hospitals not universities anyway; only some of these are university affiliated. The proposed council is preposterous -- physicians and pharmacists are purveyors of drugs, and already have adequate channels for making their desires felt; giving them a voice in policy would mean giving a voice to their professional organizations, which are dominated by the provincial small businessmen among them. And why on earth should universities have a voice in the drug industry's problems? Why this industry and not others? Whence came this academic elitism? Has the Party become so intellectualized that our cry is now to be "all power to the universities"? Does this proposal mean the faculties of universities, or the administrations, or the alumni who control them? As to workers -- they should of course in general have knowledgeable representatives on company boards to defend and represent their interests. But do lower-level drug employees know enough pharmacology to set research policy? Do upper-level researchers know enough about the social problems of distributing drugs to set marketing policy? Is either group particularly interested in doing these things? or should it be? Advertising does not "run up" drug costs except in the case of a handful of heavily huckstered proprietary cold remedies and such, and certainly "competition" doesn't; one trouble with the industry is that it doesn't really compete enough, the companies join together to keep prices as high as they can; excessive profiteering in this industry is explained very simply by human greed. The companies do, really, have enough sense to try not to behave with "criminal recklessness;" they know it will backfire; drugs are released with criminal recklessness not frequently, but only very rarely; when they are -- even in pre-Kefauver days

-- the company gets it in the neck from the agencies of law and order; Richardson-Merrell's top executives are even now facing jail over concealing research results; when such things do happen, profit motive is of course one factor. But most of the drug mishaps of recent years can be traced to other causes -- the sheer complicatedness of modern pharmacology, and the fact that there just aren't enough physicians trained to handle pharmacological field research. Finally, there isn't much "costly duplication of production facilities:" this is one area where supply and demand seems to work; companies don't come out with drugs where other companies have the field sewed up tight; and the manufacturing requirements for drugs are so complex, that to produce enough of a new drug soon enough, usually the government has to require the patent-holder to license other manufacturers, each of whom has to invent, in effect, a factory. The fact that they tend to invent different types of factories is one reason why the U.S. drug industry is tops in developmental research. Any why should universities get involved in drug production? They have other things to do.

But all this is criticism of the passage on a very petty level; I could write another passage which called for nationalizing the drug industry without sounding uninformed. Let us assume for the sake of the argument that this has been done. I must then say that I still cannot defend nationalizing the drug industry. I cannot do so for three reasons: I disagree on principle, I disagree even more on tactics, and even if I agreed in both respects my personal situation makes it impossible for me to act as spokesman for this view. Let me take up these three grounds one at a time:

1) The drug industry is not a commanding height of industry. Or, at least, others are more commanding -- on any list of U.S. industries in order of their impact on the economy, this one ranks pretty far down. Why -- at least, why now -- pick out this one for mention and ignore so many more basic ones?

Likewise, socialized medicine does not offer a case for nationalizing the drug industry. In Britain and Sweden, for instance, drugs certainly are not nationalized. What is nationalized is the cost of drugs to patients. It goes without saying that this involves price controls for drugs -- and I certainly hope the Party defends that section of the Kefauver bill (which was the section that failed to pass). Drug profits are exorbitant and ought to be regulated, and came very near to being regulated not long ago.

The main problem with regulating drugs lies in the perennial problem of regulating anything in our present system: The regulatory agency tends to become controlled by the industry it supposedly regulates. Here, I grant, nationalization is the easiest solution. But again, why pick out drugs especially?

And on the other side, there is one very strong argument against nationalizing drugs. It lies in the nature of the research process. Costly duplication of effort -- which this proposal the Party now officially makes, decries -- is vital to research. I feel deeply uneasy over the prospect of any centralized coordination of research.

That's how it's done in Russia, and it's one of the major things wrong with Russian medicine. Russian pharmacology is monolithic. No drug is used at all until very late, and then suddenly it's used for everything. Soviet medicine has many achievements to its credit, but not in pharmacology. The American drug companies are far from perfect in their research -- on basic research they stink, and most of the companies weigh their research toward what is profitable rather than toward what is necessarily medically desirable. But American developmental research is the best in the world. It was foreigners who first got on the track of tranquilizers and antibiotics; it was private American companies that grabbed this research lead and

turned it, in both cases -- and in many others -- into a practical spectrum of safe, usable, available drugs; who developed dozens of new antibiotics and tranquilizers; who worked out radically new ways of producing them cheaply.

There are ways of saving the merits of American private drug research while compensating for the demerits. NIH research does much in this direction already. My proposal -- written into previous platforms -- is for a government company to become a competing entity in the drug business. Other ideas are possible. Nationalizing is not, as I see it, a way of coping here. Central coordination of research would be downright dangerous.

2) Tactically, nationalizing the drug industry is a side issue. I don't want to get involved in it. I want to talk about socializing medicine.

A few days ago I debated a doctor on WNBC, and he tried twice to get me off onto the subject of drugs and nationalizing drugs. I was able to say that this was a side issue, that the drug industry is not nationalized in Britain, that I am not interested in nationalizing the drug industry, and let's talk about what's wrong with medical care in this country. At that time the Party had already reversed me on this, but luckily I didn't know about it then (nobody bothered to tell me). If I had known, I would have been unable to reply as I did. I would have been obligated to follow my opponent down this sidetrack and argue for nationalizing the drug industry. This would have weakened me seriously in the debate.

This illustration is not an isolated incident. I get asked about nationalizing the drug industry virtually every time I appear in public on this issue. It is impossible for me to speak for socialized medicine for the Party and avoid the question of nationalizing the drug industry. This passage in the platform, then, is tantamount to an order from the Party to argue a position which I not only do not believe in, but which I cannot argue without revealing myself in respect to the position that I am more basically supposed to be defending and advocating. I feel I have been, at very least, gravely handicapped.

This handicap must be regarded in the light of the special problems of advocating socialized medicine. The AHA delights to debate us on this subject because it's a way of asserting their point that socialized medicine equals socialism, which they use as a scare word. They are trying to use us. And we in turn try to use them. I have learned that I can always rely on an AHA spokesman -- without fail -- to rebait me if he's stupid, or if he's clever to turn the discussion into a debate over socialism per se. Now obviously I want to use this issue to advocate socialism in every way I can. Just as obviously, I don't want to throw away the issue itself and I don't want to play into the AHA's line. My cue, then, is to stick strictly to the subject and let my opponent turn it to more basic issues. This has never failed yet. My opponent gets the onus of changing the subject and this rebounds to my credit. The SP gets credit for stoutly advocating this issue and trying to do a good job with it.

This whole matter is anything but trivial. Socialized medicine is a subject concerning which we command a large audience of nonsocialists. There aren't a lot of such issues -- perhaps no other bread-and-butter issues; our audience on this issue is different from our other audiences. Our work for socialized medicine, besides promoting a worthy cause, gets us the respect of people who are seriously interested in practical work for an immediate issue. They respect us more if we seem to be truly devoted to this issue and not engaging in you-know-who's trick of using it for ulterior purposes. At very least our work for socialized medicine helps our public image; in some measure it helps recruit. It is important for us. Socialization of the drug industry, even to those in our audience who favor it, is an extraneous subject, since they know perfectly well that drug companies in England, etc., aren't socialized. This is not the kind of audience that wants us

R. W. Tucker

-6-

to go ahead and be as radical as we know how; they want a familiar liberal rhetoric and a feeling that we mean serious business this year, not next generation. Drug nationalization seems way out to many who favor socialized medicine and indeed to many who favor socialism. Socialized medicine is one of the very few issues -- I can think of no others that are comparable -- in which we can appear practical rather than theoretical. Going off on a tangent into drug nationalization is just a way of thoroughly lousing up our whole pitch.

3) We all have to make compromises. My personal situation is that I have to earn my living on the journalistic fringes of medicine. Indeed it is this mainly that keeps me au courant with the field; if I worked in another area I could not easily work for socialized medicine. I am persona non grata with organized medicine, but fortunately, not yet with the drug industry -- if I were, I'd have to work in another field altogether. At this point I don't feel ready to make my name stink to the drug industry; I'd rather earn a living. I have lots to say about that industry's sins, but I intend to say it anonymously. I cannot defend the position you have adopted anonymously because it would have to be done in the course of my defense of socialized medicine which I'm in too deep to start being anonymous about. That's assuming I agreed with the position and that it was tactically wise.

You must see by now that you have put me in an impossible position.

A final point. The Party asked me to make myself its spokesman on medical reform, and I did so. I think in return the Party owes me this much: It doesn't go adopting positions in this area without at least consulting me. And when the proposal is one I have opposed for years, it makes a special effort to give me a chance to argue against it BEFORE adopting it. I really must say I feel I've been badly used.

Very fraternally yours,

R. W. TUCKER

Letters From Members

-7-

LEO LEOPOLD, member-at-large, Easthampton, Mass.

You will be interested to know that in remarks made at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., on the occasion of the visit of President Johnson, Governor Peabody of Massachusetts told the audience that one of its illustrious sons was Michael Harrington, author of THE OTHER AMERICA. If you see Mike, I am certain he will love to know about this....

I am now receiving regularly SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION. I see to it that others in the state get my copies and Henry Fine also subscribes so that between us we are all pretty well informed on international happenings in the socialist world.

I have sent Julius Bernstein a number of clippings and asked that he forward them to you. If he has not done so you might remind him. Sometimes I only have one copy and I use the above way of setting it to both....

I recently had a rather lengthy conference with Yugoslavian UN Ambassador Danielo Lekec. It was on the occasion of presenting him with the signatures of 50% of the student body on a petition requesting the release of Milovan Djilas. His position was that the Djilas arrest was only Yugoslavia's business. I told him that it was no more Yugoslavia's business than Mississippi was only America's or Apartheid was only South Africa's. He did not budge from his position which was identical with that proclaimed by Tito in Belgrade. The signatures were collected by Paul Duval and I, both SP members. We could have collected many more but for our purposes that percentage was sufficient. In the course of the year we have run two civil rights meetings on campus, directed the massive picketing of Gov. Wallace, signed up one member, sent in eight subs to NEW AMERICA, sold about twenty paperback copies of Harrington's book, distributed hundreds of the NEW AMERICA (NA) promotional leaflet with the coupon. I have volunteered to tutor for the civil rights movement in Springfield, being unable to leave the area. Our state office has sold a raft of Harrington's paperback copies. My twenty were only a small part of it.

We are planning a conference in October in Boston on the general topic of class discrimination in the public schools. We plan to make it the occasion of setting up a New England regional SP organization, headquartered in Boston, to include all New England states but Connecticut, which is usually more oriented toward New York. This organization of course would be subject to NC approval...

WILLARD F. SMITH, member-at-large, Woodland, Calif.

Having supported the Socialist movement since 1917, I am discouraged to see what little, if anything, we have to show for our efforts. I believe that the general public will rally to Socialism when we can point to a spot in our economy where it is functioning as nearly perfectly as it can in a basically profit economy. Socialists can accomplish this, and I have ideas as to how. If there is interest, let us hear from other members.

TOM CONDIT, San Francisco Local.

I'm embarked on a personal project of filling out the collections of Socialist periodicals in the library of San Francisco State College. I've already completed their set of Dissent, and am now working on the Socialist Call. I find that I have 1953, 1954, 1959 and 1960 complete, but I'm missing a few copies in between.

Specifically, I need an extra copy of Vol. XXII No. 12 and Vol. XXIII No. 1 (which came out as a double issue) so that these two years can be bound separately. In Vol. XXIII (1955), I need No. 9 (September). In Vol. XIV (1956), I need No. 12 (December) (assuming this issue came out). In Vol. XXV (1957), I need Nos. 3 through 5 (March to May) and Nos. 7 & 8 (July and August). In Vol. XXVI (1958), I need No. 6 (June). I assume that Vol. XXVII ended with number 8 (Winter) and I therefore have it complete. This comes to 9 issues in theory, but some of them were probably doubles. If anyone can contribute these, I'd be highly grateful. If there are any bound volumes of the Call newspaper which fall in direct sequence backward from 1953, we could use these too.

You might pass the word around among comrades in New York that we're trying in general to build up the library here with socialist literature, and would welcome anything they have around the house and want to get rid of. Anything we receive goes either to (a) the SF YPSL library (which is already quite extensive), (b) SF State College library (which will bind old pamphlets, etc., to make them part of the permanent collection) or (c) university libraries in Asia (where SF State sends its duplicates). In any case, they will be where people can get at them to read them....

I have placed on file the Party platforms for 1948, 1952, and 1960, and can use any for other years. As you can see, what I'm trying to do is get a complete set of material on socialism and on the SP in particular in this library. I can also use old constitutions (I have 1912 and 1934), state platforms, and any publication I can get a complete set of. Likewise Convention proceedings, etc.

Clifton Daland, member-at-large, Battle Creek, Michigan

In our statements of policy, and throughout our literature, we are always making "demands". Presumably this means we feel that others than ourselves, who are able to meet these demands, should do so.

There are only two sources from which our demands can be met; (a) surplus savings and excessive reserves in the hands of the "power structure"; and (b) Government funds. If we don't announce our understanding, briefly and succinctly, of the fact that we recognize both sides of the prevailing economic set-up, inevitably we will draw more criticism than commendation, e.g.: to put it bluntly, "They're always expecting handouts from the Government."

Even though a minuscule proportion of us hold actual title to these means, because of our distorted nation-wide emphasis on the "ownership of property" we know they are amply available. Else how do the useless space moon-shots get paid for, while 30,000,000 of our fellow-citizens are in poverty?

We know that our demands are more than amply justified. We also know that we - all of us - throughout the country ARE the Government. I believe we should say so - frequently, plainly, and unmistakably. We'd get more adequate attention to our demands if we made it a policy always to couple them with a statement that we are fully cognizant not only of the present situation but also of the fact that it includes not only those who are holding and using the "power" but also all the rest of us whose presence as citizens and whose efforts as workers really produce the money power....

Somehow we must try to get more people to understand the above facts while also not forgetting that people, all people, are human beings with the basic, inalienable rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

Even at the risk of seeming sentimental we must show, so that it cannot be mistaken, that human values and human rights definitely and ultimately are, DISTINCTLY AND IRREVOCABLY above property rights and money power. To me, that is a large part of what Socialism really means.

- 1) We hope to expand the activity of our campus club, the New Fabian Society. It appears to be on a firm footing for general discussion.
- 2) We are going to try to set up a YPSL chapter in St. Louis. A week or so ago, there was a regional CORE conference in St. Louis, to which we sent Jim Hamilton, Gordon Burnside, and Byron Lander. They sold all their literature, and have gained the impression that there is great potential there. As a first step we are writing the St. Louis comrades and sympathizers to try to find someone who will be an anchor there. Secondly, Jerry Jouret has agreed to drive into St. Louis two or three times to act as organizer, specifically to hold two Socialist forums for CORE people and for Washington Univ. We all agree that this is target number 1. When Jim Hamilton graduates (a year from June) he has agreed to get a job in St. Louis and I know he will be an excellent full-time organizer.
- 3) The members agreed to begin ordering New America on a bundle basis for distribution. We will try to sell it, and will also try to get the local bookstore to sell it.
- 4) We have sent out about 80 fund-drive letters to our state and local list and will send out some more in the future. So far no checks have come in, but we have got hopes, especially when we hit the faculty people here, since many of them are sympathetic.
- 5) We have a May Day party planned. The members expect to get at least 100 people to come and are excited about it.
- 6) We have put out a newsletter irregularly, and are now thinking of putting it out on a more permanent basis, in which case we would send it to our state list as a means of keeping them from feeling so isolated.
- 7) There is a local TV station here which is owned by reactionaries and which presents as a public service the "Manion Forum" (Birch) every Friday night at prime time. We have a fellow drawing up an FCC brief and will demand free and equal time. Dick Martin is in charge of the project and we are pretty sure of getting at least three 15-minute shots at the radical right in the name of the Socialist Party. We also have a research team for this project. If it clicks, we'll be happy to pass the technique on to other locals with a similar opportunity.
- 8) We plan a series of soft-sell talks on Socialism in the dorms, with Gordon Burnside in charge of this.

May 21, 1964

The "Thomas-Goldwater Debate" tape arrived in time, and at the present moment the campus is plastered with posters announcing the debate for tonight and challenging the Young Conservatives to come and defend their man.

One of our friends is writing his Master's Thesis on the FCC. He drew up a 3-page list of citations from FCC rulings which demonstrate clearly that it is the affirmative duty of broadcasters to present both sides of any controversial issue, even if the first presentation is sponsored and even if it is also presented under some ambiguous name such as "Americanism" or "Anti-Communism." I incorporated the citations in a letter which I sent to KCC demanding equal time and at the same time Dick Martin began to tape the "Manion Forum." In my letter, which was sent on April 30, I asked for time immediately after the Manion Show (i.e., 10:30, Friday night), and pointed out that I was sending a carbon copy of my request to the FCC. Exactly one week later I got a phone call from KRCG-TV offering us the time. In all our dealings with the TV station since, they have been exceedingly polite. The reason is, that (as I pointed out to them in my letter) they had been violating FCC regulations for over two years by never presenting an alternative to Manion. This is why they acceded to all our demands.

Columbia, Mo.

-10-

Our first show went on last Friday (May 15) which only gave us 6 days to write the script, prepare the visual aids, and rehearse. It was a real rush. The show was called "Socialism & Foreign Aid" and was to be a refutation of the "Manion Forum" of April 3, on the same subject. We stressed poverty in the underdeveloped world, the need for industry to overcome poverty, the differing effects between internal and external capital formation, and wound up by giving the 6 points on foreign aid from our 1962 platform. We also asked people to write us for a copy of the program. Gordon Burnside did the introduction and the wind-up and I did the main body of the program.

The response has been most heartening. At least a hundred people have stopped me to say how much they enjoyed it, and how glad they were that we were taking on the rightists. At least a dozen have offered to help in future programs. We've gotten in three letters so far, all from people that we never heard of before who express interest in Socialism. I know of an additional 30 people who have written to KRCCG-TV in praise of our show, and about half of them also sent carbon copies to the FCC. Several students have asked to come to our next meeting. At least in part this is due to the TV station's own stupidity. Instead of using the standard disclaimer ("not necessarily endorse the views, etc.") they introduced and wound up our program by saying that KRCCG-TV was in complete disagreement with Socialism and was only presenting the program because they were forced to. They also wrote a vicious editorial in their newspaper ("Socialism-Peddling Prof") which tries to get me fired from my job. I've sent it to my lawyer to see if it's libelous. This won us a lot of sympathy. (Since the "Manion Forum" came right before our program, the contrast between their "not necessarily" endorsing him and being in "complete disagreement" with us was painfully obvious.) But they won't do that again. Dick wrote them to call a foul, again with a carbon copy to the FCC....

All of this has led us to the following idea. I am going to try to raise \$500.00 in order to put 10 programs on film. They won't be able to mess that up technically, we won't have to kill ourselves rehearsing, and also the film will be available for other locals around the country. Manion's show is filmed, and there must be countless places where it's shown. With film, all it would take is one Socialist in the area to write the original letter and ship the film to them. Our listening audience is about 150,000. Multiply that by 10 and you begin to get an idea of the number of people we could reach. We have a fellow who has a master's in cinematography and access to excellent equipment, so the \$500.00 would be only the cost of the film itself. I'd be happy to supply the NO with a mimeo copy of the FCC citations and a set of instructions on how to get equal time....

I don't think I ever told you about our May Day Party. It was very nice. About 125 people came, we had a profit of \$18.00, and there were speeches, songs, nostalgia, etc. It was so pleasant that the comrades wanted to have another one immediately, but I convinced them that too much of a good thing is not good....

Fraternally,

Bill Allen
714 Ingleside Drive
Columbia, Mo.

Report on Activities
by Betty Elkin

-11-

The summer of 1964, from the reports to the National Office, seems to have been an active one for members of the Socialist Party. Meetings and picnics were held, and plans for the Fall season made. Although our reports are scanty from some areas (and non-existence from others, unfortunately), we pass on to you the information we have received and hope that our next report will be more complete.

The one summer activity that involved members from many areas was the camp at South Haven, Michigan, arranged by Local Chicago for the Labor Party weekend. It was attended by members from Akron and Cleveland, Ohio; Indianapolis, Ind.; Urbana and Chicago, Ill.; Madison, Wisc.; Detroit, Mich.; and Columbia, Mo.. Approximately 40 members took part in a discussion on Sunday afternoon on general proposals for increased cooperation and a possible regional organization in the mid-West area. The group passed the following suggestions for referral and discussion in the locals: that a delegated conference be called in Chicago on Friday, November 27, at 7:00 P.M., to consider proposals and to consult with the NO which will be meeting in Chicago the following day; and that each branch, local and state organization send no more than two delegates each to the conference, and that a two-thirds majority be required to pass any decision which is biding on the conference. A temporary agenda was set up, with locals asked to add any items if they wished. The agenda suggested was: organizational needs and resources, speakers and tours, organizer, and mid-West news organ. Each local was asked to report, if possible far enough in advance so that the reports could be circulated, on their particular organizational needs and resources and on their general remarks on these and any other items. Comrade Peter Meyer was elected as temporary convener with the use of the facilities of the Chicago office, and locals were asked to send communications to him at the Chicago address, 64 E. Van Buren.

Many letters were exchanged during the summer in order to arrange a tour by Comrade Norman Thomas in late October from the Chicago to the Los Angeles area. When the Chicago speaking date for Comrade Thomas was changed, the tour was broadened to include Indianapolis and Cleveland. Final dates and places settled upon were: Cleveland, October 24; Indianapolis, October 25; Boulder, October 26; Houston, October 27; Tucson, October 28; San Francisco, October 29; Los Angeles, October 30 and 31, with a return to New York on November 1st. In each place Comrade Thomas will speak at an evening meeting on the subject "A Socialist View of the 1964 Campaign." This is a heavy schedule with much traveling, and we can only be grateful to Comrade Thomas for suggesting and making such an extensive trip.

Arizona

The NEW AMERICA forum held a memorial meeting for the three civil rights activists killed in Mississippi on August 21st, with speakers from NAACP, CORE and other groups. They also hope to have Emil Mazey speak for them before the election, as well as the Norman Thomas meeting.

California

The Socialist Party in Los Angeles held its annual picnic on June 21st, followed by a membership meeting on June 27th for a report on the SP National Convention. Public meetings were held on July and August following the Republican and Democratic Conventions, with Alex Garber as the speaker. On September 26th,

Activities

-12-

Comrade Francis Heisler, noted labor lawyer and peace advocate, spoke on "The Deafening Silence: Who Speaks for Lasting Peace?". Local Los Angeles will honor Norman Thomas's 80th birthday on October 31st, with a testimonial dinner. Over 500 people attended a similar dinner on the occasion of Thomas's 75th birthday.

Local San Francisco reports that membership meetings are being regularly held on the second Friday of each month, with public forums held on the fourth Friday of each month. On July 30th the topic was the 1964 elections, and on August 28th the topic was Vietnam. Comrades William Shirley and Bogden Denitch were among the speakers at these forums. A class series was held every Wednesday in August, with Bogden Denitch as discussion leader. The topics were: "The Labor Movement as an Instrument for Social Progress," "Are Mass Radical Politics Possible?" "Nationalization: Road to Democracy or a Bureaucratic Society?," and "What is a Socialist Foreign Policy?" A new series of classes held weekly on Thursday was scheduled to start September 3rd.

From Local East Bay, which includes Oakland and Berkeley areas, we have reports that the University Branch and Community Action Branch sponsored a public meeting July 28th on "Socialists in the 1964 Elections," the first of a series of discussions on the Socialist perspective in the 1964 election campaign. The New Perspectives Branch of Local East Bay presented a series of seminars each Thursday in August, on the general subject of Marxism and democratic Socialism. James Burnett was discussion leader in the first seminar, with Bogden Denitch as discussion leader in the remaining three.

Illinois

Local Chicago held a series of public meetings on "Platform for a New America." Although our information on this series is incomplete, the subject of the last two discussions were civil rights and education. On August 25th a forum was presented on "Should Socialists Support LBJ?" Following the very successful South Haven weekend, Local Chicago held an annual picnic on September 20th. Norman Thomas debated Robert Welch, head of the Birch Society, in Chicago on September 25th, with 2800 attending. This was not sponsored by the Socialist Party, but they report \$113 worth of literature sold at the debate. On October 5th, Comrade Erich Fromm, under the sponsorship of the Socialist Party, spoke on "What is Humanist Socialism?" Local Chicago is also honoring Norman Thomas on the occasion of his 80th birthday, the testimonial dinner taking place on November 28th, as well as serving as host for the National Committee, which will meet in Chicago on November 28th and 29th.

Indiana

The Indiana Socialist Bulletin reported on the camp at South Haven, the Norman Thomas meeting on October 25th, and a proposed tour by Comrade Michael Harrington the first week in December throughout the Indiana area.

Missouri

The New Fabian Society, originally founded by Socialist Party members at the University of Missouri in Columbia, reports planned meetings every Thursday in October and every other Thursday in November and December. In October, the first three meetings will discuss: "Harlem and the Violence in the Black Ghettoes," "The Norman Thomas-Goldwater Debate," and "Should the American Left Support Johnson?" The

Activities

-13-

comrades there also report that they picketed the Goldwater headquarters in Columbia and nearby Centralia.

New York

On June 19th the Brooklyn branch held the last of a series of six public meetings, with Norman Hill speaking on "Civil Rights and Jobs." On June 22 a general membership meeting heard a report on the Socialist Party National Convention. On July 13th the Lower Manhattan Branch sponsored Harrington and Garber in a discussion on "Goldwater's Nomination: Will It Move the Country Right or Left?" On August 18th the Socialist Party co-sponsored with the League for Industrial Democracy a public meeting featuring Bayard Rustin on "The Meaning of the Riots." A general membership meeting on September 14 discussed the means by which Socialists may best present our platform to the labor, civil rights and community groups in this campaign. The Lower Manhattan Branch called a membership meeting on September 24th to make plans for the winter activities. The annual Debs Day dinner usually given by Local New York in November has been cancelled this year, due to conflict with the birthday party being planned for Norman Thomas on December 6th.

Ohio

As many comrades throughout the country know, the Ohio State Organization has an official paper, Strike, edited by Comrade Ken Freedman of Cleveland. Vol. I, no. 6 is the most recent issue, with no. 7 expected to be a little late due to the immanent revival of the second Freedman baby. The Ohio state organization held a state meeting on September 20th in Columbus. Local Cleveland also reports that a series of forums will be held this fall.

Pennsylvania

In Philadelphia a general meeting of the Local on July 15th discussed plans for the local battle on poverty. The Center City Branch held public meetings on August 12th on Vietnam and September 18th on the Norman Thomas-Goldwater debate. A summer picnic was also held on August 29th. The major activity of the Philadelphia comrades was a Labor Day rally held on September 13th at Independence Hall, with Norman Thomas and Norm Hill speaking. 21 organizations co-sponsored this meeting.

We hear that Pittsburgh's annual summer picnic on the farm of Dave Rinne was almost completely rained out. We wish the comrades better luck on the next date.

Texas

Comrade Ben Levy reports that the Houston Socialist Forum has about 35 people willing to accept committee assignments. A public meeting on August 23rd discussed "The Role of the Left in the November Election." Comrade Levy spoke in Austin at the Unitarian Church on the general subject of Socialism. The Norman Thomas speaking date for October 27th is being eagerly anticipated by our friends there.

Washington

The Washington State Organization held a state convention on Tuesday.

September 15th, in Seattle. State Secretary Carl Schwartz was the keynote speaker, pointing out that the Socialist Party is needed more than ever to counteract the pressures from the Right. Comrade Schwartz was re-elected State Secretary, and Comrade Bill McQuesten was praised for his work in editing the Washington State Bulletin. A state platform was adopted, pointing out that one of the most urgent needs was a state-wide income tax to replace the present sales tax.

Wisconsin

The major activity of the Wisconsin State Organization was the annual picnic held on August 8th, 1964 being the 64th annual picnic. Comrade Peter Meyer was one of the speakers, and tape recorded messages were broadcast from Norman Thomas and A. Philip Randolph. A mimeographed four-page Picnic News Bulletin (in three colors) publicized the picnic. Comrade Frank Zeidler reports that 125, which was a 50% increase over last year, attended, and that there were many young people present.

Personals

The Socialist Party has lost two very valuable members this summer. Comrade Paul Albright, secretary of the Los Angeles Local, and Comrade Gene Yeager, a long-time leader of the Boulder Local, were killed in automobile accidents. The Socialist Party mourns the loss of these valuable comrades and extends to their locals our sincerest sympathies and regrets.

Many of you will remember Comrade Morris Stempa, who has been an active member of the Socialist Party since the early 1900's. His daughter writes us that he has now entered the Home for the Chronic Sick, Long Branch, New Jersey, for an indefinite stay. We hope that many of you who knew him will write to him there.

Comrade Frank Zeidler reports that his duties as head of the Wisconsin Department of Resource Development keep him very busy traveling throughout the Middle West and the state of Wisconsin. His duties include promoting industrial development, administering the Economic Opportunity Program in the state, developing open space and transportation programs along with urban renewal and housing.

Comrade Paul O'Rourke has been appointed as Director of the War Against Poverty in the state of California. We congratulate Comrade O'Rourke and offer him our best wishes in his new position.

Comrade Martin Oppenheimer of Pennsylvania is co-author of a "Manual for Direct Action" published by the American Friends Service Committee, 160 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa. Copies may be ordered through them (if I remember correctly, the price is 50¢).

Publications

We have published this summer a four-page excerpt from our 1964 platform. This is in the NEW AMERICA format, and bundle orders are available at 4¢ each. We are taking orders for the complete platform now, for delivery in two weeks (probable price 35¢). Norman Thomas's speech to the Socialist Party Convention in Chicago was reprinted in the June 16th issue of NEW AMERICA, and the coming issue of NEW AMERICA will reprint excerpts from the Norman Thomas-Goldwater debate. Locals may want to reproduce these for distribution on their literature tables.

Note also The Economics of Equality, the long-awaited new pamphlet by Tom Kahn. The SP edition is available at 75¢ each, 40% off in orders of 10 or more.

Dear Comrades,

I will be happy if you will **take** this as a personal letter about our Party and the Fund Drive which opens November 1st. It must succeed, if Democratic Socialism is to live in the USA.

You, like myself, wish to be a Socialist not only "in your heart" - to steal a phrase from Senator Goldwater - but in your head, to which the Senator seldom appeals. But we personally need the Party as a kind of invaluable reservoir to which we contribute and from which we draw.

More than that, the Party is absolutely essential if the whole concept of Socialism is to be furthered in the United States. We dare not leave its interpretation to our enemies on the Right. Cyrus Sulzberger, international correspondent of the N.Y. Times, has deplored the fact that Socialism has so largely been made a dirty word in the U.S., whereas it is almost everywhere else a good word even with those whose practice leaves much to be desired.

Neither can we leave the interpretation of our Socialism and the spread of its ideas to devotees of Trotsky or Khrushchev or, much less, Mao. We need our own party, our own publication and our own program. We have a right to be proud of our 1964 platform and a duty to spread its concrete message.

The blatant anti-labor candidate of the Republican Party for Vice President says that the issue in this campaign is "socialism versus capitalism" - which latter he usually miscalls "free enterprise." I wish this statement were nearer the truth, especially now that we stand on the threshold of an economy of abundance which cybernetics makes possible. Democratic Socialism is essential to the management of that economy. It is our job to make this truth plain to our fellow citizens. Hence it is absolutely imperative that we at least raise the budget set forth by our governing committee.

I marvel that our little staff does such good work with such insufficient security. I have had to make my own contribution early, to help keep things going. Please give yours as generously and as promptly as you can.

Faternally yours,

Norman Thomas

1964-65 FUND DRIVE QUOTAS (Total, \$12,020)

Arizona \$200, East Bay Area \$750, Los Angeles \$1300, Boulder \$150, Washington D.C. \$200, Illinois \$1200, New Orleans \$50, Massachusetts \$500, Ann Arbor \$100, Detroit \$400, Missouri \$100, Central Jersey \$100, Northern Jersey \$50, Nassau \$600, Suffolk \$100, New York City \$2400, Cleveland \$700, Columbus \$30, Toledo \$50, Local Berks \$200, Philadelphia \$300, Pittsburgh \$200, Washington State \$150, Wisconsin \$350, California At Large \$100, Connecticut \$100, Florida \$50, Indiana \$150, Iowa \$100, Minnesota \$90, New Jersey At Large \$50, New York At Large \$250, Ohio At Large \$150, Pennsylvania At Large \$100, Texas \$50, Foreign \$100, Northern New England \$50, National Office \$500.